©
Government of Kerala
1971

Reg. No. K. 107

KERALA GAZETTE

SUPPLEMENTS

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Vol. XVI] Trivandrum, Tuesday, 2nd February 1971 / 13th Magha 1892 (Saka) [No. 5

PART I

CONTENTS

Public Department

1. G. O. (P) No. 22/71/PD. dated 14th January 1971 (Delegation of Powers to Heads of Departments).
2. G. O. (MS) 16/71/PD. dated 11th January 1971 (Period of Temporary exemption to allotted officers belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes—Further Extension).

Labour & Social Welfare Department

Awards of Industrial Tribunals

3. Calicut 57/68

Section 1

4. No. 17309/B2/70/Law dated 2nd January 1971 {The Agricultural Produce Cess (Amendment) Act, 1970 (40 of 1970) }.

Section iii

5. No. 14451/H2/70/Law dated 2nd December 1970 [Kerala Agriculturists and Tenants (Temporary Protection) Act, 1970 (Act 20 of 1970) (Malayalam version)].

6. 11902/F3/70/Act dated 27th November 1970 [The Calicut University (Amendment) Act, 1970 (Tamil Version)].

7. No. 5237/F3/70/Act dated 20th April 1970 [The Kerala University (Second Amendment) Ordinance, 1970 (Tamil Version)].

8. No. 13986/H2/70/Law dated 30th November 1970 [The Nerala General Sales Tax (Amendment) Act, 1970 (Tamil Version)].

Section iv

9—12 S. R. O. Nos. 40, 42, 43 and 44/71.

Kerala Gazette No. 5 dated 2nd February 1971
PART I

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Abstract

DELEGATION OF POWERS TO HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS—ENHANCEMENT OF—ORDERS ISSUED

PUBLIC (MISCELLANEOUS) DEPARTMENT

G. O. P. No. 22/71/PD. Dated, Trivandrum, 14th January 1971.

Read:—1. G. O. P. No. 248/PD dated 24-4-1962.
2. G. O. P. No. 243/PD dated 20-7-1970.

ORDER

In the G. O. read as 1st paper above Government had delegated certain financial and administrative powers to Heads of Departments and Administrative Departments of the Secretariat. In the G. O. read as 2nd paper above Government have delegated certain additional powers to the Heads of Departments to facilitate speedy implementation of schemes. This includes the power to sanction the sale in auction of fallen and dead trees, standing on Government lands under the control of the Departments concerned.

2. It has been brought to the notice of Government that at times the Heads of Departments will have to dispose of in public auction living trees also when they obstruct the construction of new buildings or when they are likely to fall on the roof of existing buildings etc.

3. Government are therefore pleased to delegate to all the Heads of Departments, the power to sanction the sale in auction of living trees, standing on Government lands under the control of the Departments concerned, if necessary.

By order of the Governor,
V. CHANDRASEKHARAN NAIR,
Under Secretary.

To

The Accountant General (This issues with the concurrence of Finance Department).
The Finance Department.
All Heads of Departments.
All District Collectors.
All Departments of the Secretariat
The Registrar, University of Kerala/Calicut (with C. L.)
The Registrar, High Court of Kerala (with C. L.)
The Secretary, Kerala Public Service Commission (with C. L.)
The Secretary to Governor.
All Secretaries, Additional Secretaries, Joint Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries and Under Secretaries.
The Stenographer to Chief Secretary.

Kerala Gazette No. 5 dated 2nd February 1971
PART I

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Abstract

PUBLIC SERVICES—DEPARTMENTAL TESTS—PERIOD OF TEMPORARY EXEMPTION TO ALLOTTED OFFICERS BELONGING TO SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES—FURTHER EXTENSION ORDERED.

PUBLIC (SERVICES D) DEPARTMENT

G. O. (MS) 16/71/PD. *Dated, Trivandrum, 11th January* 1971.

Read:—1. G. O. (P) 22/PD dated 14-1-1963.

2. G O. (P) 628/PD, dated 6-10-1965.
3. Government Circular No. 4943/SD3/68/PD dated 9-2-1968.
4. G. O. (MS) 12/70/PD dated 13-1-1970.
5. Memorandum dated 21-11-70 from the President, Kerala Harijan Samskarika Kshema Samithi, Trivandrum.
6. Memorandum dated 26-11-1970 from the General Secretary, Government Employees Association (S. Cs. & S. Ts.) Kerala.
7. Letter No. AII (1) 51333/70 dated 8-1-1971 from the Secretary, Kerala Public Service Commission, Trivandrum.

ORDER

In the Government Circular read as third paper above, Government have clarified that members of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes allotted from Madras and T-C. States to Kerala would be eligible for temporary exemption from passing the unified Account Test and Tests in Office Procedure introduced in the G. O. read as first paper above for a period of seven years from 14-1-1963. In the G. O. fourth cited a further extension of one year from 14-1-1970 was granted to these officers as a special case. Government have since received representations from the Kerala Harijan Samskarika Kshema Samithy, Trivandrum and the Government Employees Association (S. Cs. & S. Ts.) Kerala, Trivandrum requesting permanent exemption from the tests introduced in G. O. read as first paper above to the allotted personnel belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

2. Government have examined the matter in consultation with the Public Service Commission and are pleased to sanction a further extension of

the period of temporary exemption to allottees belonging to Scheduled Castes/ Scheduled Tribes from passing the above tests by one year from 14-1-1971 as a special case in order to avoid hardship to such persons in service.

By order of the Governor,
K. RAJAGOPALAN,
Joint Secretary.

To

All Heads of Departments and Offices.
The President, Kerala Harijan Samskarika Kshema Samithy, T. C. 15/60, Jagathy, Trivandrum-14.
The General Secretary, Govt. Employees Association (S. Cs. & S. Ts.) Kerala, Midlands Lodge, Press Road, Trivandrum.
The Secretary, Kerala Public Service Commission (with C. L.)
The Secretary, Kerala State Electricity Board "
The Registrar, University of Kerala, Trivandrum (with C. L.)
The Registrar, University of Calicut, Calicut (with C. L.)
The Registrar, High Court, Ernakulam (with C. L.)
The Advocate General, Ernakulam.(with C. L.)
The General Manager, Kerala State Road Transport Corporation. (with C. L.)
The Accountant General, Kerala
All Officers and all Sections of the Secretariat including Law, Finance & Legislature.
The Secretary to the Governor.
The Private Secretaries to Chief Minister and other Ministers.
The Stenographer to the Chief Secretary.

Copy to:—

The Director of Public Relations (6 copies)

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Labour and Social Welfare (A) Department

NOTIFICATION

No. 43932/A4/70/LSWD. *Dated, Trivandrum, 27th November* 1970.

The award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calicut in respect of the dispute between the Managing Director, Therlek Furnaces (P) Ltd., Tripunithura, and their workmen represented by the General Secretary, Ernakulam District Electric Furnaces and Engineering Workers' Union, Vyttila, Ernakulam received by Government on 21-11-1970 is hereby published under section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order of the Governor,
C. K. Kochukoshy
Secretary.

Before the Court of the Industrial Tribunal, Calicut

(Saturday, the 21st day of November, Nineteen hundred and seventy)

Present:

Shri R. K. VENU NAYAR, B. A., B. L.,
Industrial Tribunal, Calicut

Between

THE MANAGING DIRECTOR,
Therlek Furnaces (P) Ltd., Tripunithura

And

THE GENERAL SECRETARY
Ernakulam District Electric Furnaces and Engineering Workers Union, Vyttila, Ernakulam

Representation:

M/s. Menon & Pai,
Advocates,
Ernakulam. — For *Management.*

M/s. T. C. N. Menon and
P. Sankarankutty,
Advocates,
Ernakulam — For *Union*

AWARD

This is an Industrial dispute referred to this Tribunal, by Government of Kerala as per Order No. G. O. Rt 827/69 LSWD dated 7-11-1969 of the Labour and Social Welfare (H) Department. The issues referred are the following:

1. Bonus for the year 1967-69.
2. Restoration of allowances and amenities.
3. Dismissal of Venugopal, K. X. Varghese, K. S. Antony, A. X. Josath, K. P. Raphael and M. S. Thomas.

2. Both the parties appeared before this court and filed their statement and counter statement and adduced oral and documentary evidence. The Union has made an endorsement on the reference order saying that they are not pressing issues No. 1 and 2 and hence this award has reference only to issue No. 3.

3. The Union's case as stated in their statement regarding Issue No. 3 is as follows: This management is engaged in the manufacture of electric furnaces, ovens and other allied articles and one of their factory is situated at Trippunithura with about 75 workers on their rolls. The Union started functioning there from 1st December, 1967 and the management did not like this. So they wanted to do away with the union somehow and at the initial stage 27 workers were retrenched from service. At the intervention of the Assistant Labour Officer, Ernakulam and other persons an agreement was reached by which the management agreed to stop the retrenchment. This agreement was signed on 11-6-1968. In the meanwhile the management went ahead with its proposal to make a union of its own and they approached M/s. P. Venugopalan and 4 other workers. At this particular time the negotiations for the settlement of the aforementioned dispute was going on and these workers were directed to take part in the negotiations representing the workers and thereby indirectly ruin the union. The workers felt that they have no representative capacity in view of the functioning of the union and they declined to comply with the request of the management. The management get infuriated and Sri Venugopalan was told that if he is not to accede to the request of the management they will see that his services are terminated. The managing director personally told him all these things. Since he did not oblige, the managing director threatened that he will see that necessary orders are issued to him to carry out these instructions. Accordingly an attempt was made to hand over a letter to him on 1-6-1968. Since he knew the contents of this letter he refused to accept it. Then again he was asked to meet the managing director in person and when he met him he was told that he will see that the letter is delivered to him through the peon. Accordingly the peon got it on 5-6-1968. This also he did not receive for the very same reason. The management issued a show-cause notice to which he submitted an explanation and again he was asked to meet the managing Director at his residence. On that occasion

also he expressed his inability to do as per the direction of the managing Director regarding the union activities. The worker was not prepared to do any anti-union activity and so he was dismissed from service. For these reasons the union would say that there is victimisation and it amounts to unfair labour practice. The management took this action only to spite this worker for the union activities undertaken by him in the establishment.

4A. Regarding the other 4 workers the union's case is that they are retrenched from service. About this the union case is that by the agreement dated 11-6-1968 the management had agreed to drop their proposal of retrenchment and these 4 workers are among the 27 workers whose retrenchment was contemplated and which was dropped at the intervention of the Labour Authorities. When the management issued the dismissal order in the case of Sri Venugopalan the union issued a strike notice and this retrenchment is effected on the very same day. The Union would say that there were no compelling circumstances like lack of order or loss in the business to warrant the retrenchment. The reports by the group heads in the factory also would show that they were having sufficient orders. The only reason for this retrenchment is the trade union activities of these workers. According to the union this retrenchment also amounts to victimisation and unfair labour practice. Hence the workers are entitled to be reinstated.

5. The management in the reply statement denies all these allegations. According to them there was no union functioning in the factory in 1967. Prior to that, i.e. in 1964 there were two unions representing the workers but for some reason they ceased to function and so the management requested the workers to elect a committee of 5 representatives of workers to facilitate the collective bargaining and settlement and other such functions of a trade union. This request was made by the management towards the end of 1967. Accordingly they elected Venugopalan and 4 other persons and a letter to this effect was sent by them on 27-4-1968. The management found that there was decline in the work orders due to the recession in the industry and also because of the competition in the market. They found that they had to retrench surplus workers for purposes of economy and the first batch of 15 workers were retrenched in three stages. Out of these 15, 4 persons refused to receive the retrenchment compensation and they started an agitation which finally was settled by a settlement dated 11-6-1968. According to the management they did not agree to drop the retrenchment and they never asked these 5 representative workers to take part in the conciliation conferences and they were not persuaded to do anything against the interest of the union.

6. Regarding the case of Venugopalan the management would say that the management never asked him to function in any particular way in his capacity as the representative of the workmen and they never tried to hand over any letters to that effect to this worker. But the management had issued a letter for an entirely different purpose. This had nothing to do with his trade union activities. This was a direction to him to proceed to Hyderabad to rectify certain defects in an apparatus sold by the management. These defects were noted and the management had to send a proper person

to rectify these defects. Accordingly the management issued directions to this worker and a letter to this effect was handed over to the peon to be delivered to this worker. The worker refused to accept the letter saying that he cannot receive it because the contents are known to him and that it pertains to some union matters. According to the management this contention of the worker that he had knowledge about the contents of the letter is an afterthought. He was dismissed from service for the misconduct of insubordination and indiscipline since he refused to accept the letter addressed to him. He was given notice and explanation was obtained. They conducted an enquiry and he was given opportunity to cross-examine the witness of the management and also to examine his own witnesses. On the basis of the evidence recorded at the enquiry, the enquiry officer concluded that he was guilty of the misconduct and based on this the management again issued a show-cause notice. Even at this stage the management informed him that they are prepared to take a lenient view in the matter if he agreed to apologise for the offence committed by him. Since he did not comply with this they had no alternative and so they dismissed him from service. For these reasons the management would say that they are justified in their action and hence the worker has no right to claim any relief. They also say that they have never tried to persuade this worker either by the managing director or by other responsible officers of the management to desist from the union activities.

7. Regarding the case of the other workers the management's case is that they are not dismissed but only retrenched from service for want of orders. These workers were in the refractory section and for want of work they had to discontinue to employ these persons. According to the management they are justified in this also. The rejoinder filed by the union would show that their reasons for retrenchment are not correct. According to them their works at Thana continued to function and even at Thrippunithura they continue to manufacture items they were manufacturing previously. Their contention that they are running Thrippunithura factory at a loss is also incorrect. They say that the union was functioning in the establishment from 1-.2-1967.

8. The witnesses for union are WW1 to WW3 and their documents are W1 to W11. MW1 and MW2 are for on behalf of the management and their documents are Exts M1 to M.5.

9. WW1 is the worker dismissed by the management for having refused to receive the letter handed over to him by the peon. He says that he did not refuse to go to Bangalore. He also says that he has gone to outstations for carrying out the work of the management. A few sheets of paper were attempted to be handed over to him on 30-6-1968 by the Store-in-charge Mr. Raghava Menon saying that it is a letter dated 29th. That was a letter directing him to interfere in the union activities and so he stated that he is not prepared to accept the same. According to him Ext. W1 is the copy of the letter shown to him on 30-6-1968. The same day he was sent for by the Managing Director and he asked him about this letter. He made it clear

that he cannot receive it because that will only cause him trouble. The Managing Director stated that he will issue it through the peon and accordingly it was sent in a sealed cover. The peon got it and then also he stated that he cannot receive it. Again he was asked to meet the managing Director and he met him and thereafter the show cause notice was issued. According to him the other two workers were shown the signature obtained for receipt of the show cause notice and they were made to believe that it is worker had received the copy of Ext. W1 and they received the same. The suspension order was issued the same day. He would say that he cannot say whether the workers had at a conference elected him and 4 others as their representatives. The workers were at that time represented by the union and he was also a member of the union even from January, 19 8. In 1963 the management proposed to retrench 27 workers and there was a conciliation conference in which the union and the management participated. It was at this particular time that the management asked this worker and the others to interfere and they refused. The managing Director asked this worker to do so from his residence. That request is contained in Ext. W3. Since he did not comply with this request the managing Director threatened with dismissal. Since he knew the contents of the letter attempted to be delivered by the peon he stated that he will not receive it and on former occasions the management had never issued sealed letters to workers. But in this case through the peon they offered a sealed cover. He admits that he got Ext. W4 the show cause notice to which he submitted the explanation. The enquiry was conducted thereafter and in the enquiry he submitted all these facts. After the enquiry also he was asked to explain why he should not be dismissed. Another explanation was given and he met the managing Director personally and explained the circumstances under which he refused to receive this letter. The dismissal was effected thereafter. According to him the cover produced and marked at the enquiry was not the same one offered by the peon from the office.

10. After the dismissal there was a strike which lasted for 5 months and that came to an end only after this reference. During the period of strike the management filed criminal complaints also against these workers. He would say that he is at present unemployed and he says that he is entitled to be reinstated.

11. In cross-examination he says that he took part in the enquiry from the very beginning to the end. The despatch register was shown to him. It is marked as Ext. M23. The relevant entry by which the present letter was offered to this witness is marked as Ext. M23 (a). Ext. M7 is a memorandum submitted by the workers to the management. He would say that he cannot say anything about it. He also says that he has not approached the management along with 4 other workers as representatives of workers. He went there only to report his own case. The union was also functioning there at that time. Their suggestion that these 5 persons were elected as representatives because the union was not functioning is also denied by him. When the managing director called him and asked him there was nobody else. According to him the strike was peaceful and no obstruction was

caused to any of the employers or employees. The other allegations regarding the other incidents connected with the strike are also denied by him. He admits that he has seen the notice of the closure of the factory. He cannot say how many of the workers received the closure compensation. According to him even during the period of strike and closure a few workers were working there and these persons continued to work there even after the opening. The suggestion of the management counsel that he is at present employed in some other services is also denied by him.

12. WW2 is another worker. He says that he approached the management for Vishu advance in 1968 April. He admits that he was not an office bearer of the union at that time when these 5 persons approached the management. Then they were asked to represent their matters through 3 or 4 workers and some workers went to the managing director and he was also there in it. He admits that he got Ext W1 from the house of the managing director. According to him he was compelled to receive this. In cross-examination he says that Ext. W1 was first brought by Mr. Raghava Menon, the store-in-charge. Since the contents were not correct he refused to receive it. Then the managing director called him to his house and he was given some wrong information and on the basis of it he signed it. He was told that WW1 has already received Ext. W1 and believing that he also signed it. He admits that it is true to say that the 5 persons mentioned in Ext. W1 were elected as the workers' representatives.

13. WW3 is a worker who has been retrenched as per Ext. W11. He proves Ext. W2 the conciliation settlement. According to him the management had undertaken not to retrench these workers and they retrenched when that agreement was effective. According to him he was retrenched only in connection with the union. He was dismissed saying that there is reduction in the volume of business. He has not received the retrenchment compensation and notice pay. In cross-examination he says that some of the workers received retrenchment compensation and notice pay. He is a mason and the suggestion of the management counsel that there is not sufficient work for masons is denied by him. According to him he joined the union in 1968 and the receipts for having paid the subscription are not available with him at present.

14. MW1's evidence is to the effect that he approached WW1 with the letter and that is marked as Ext. M22. The local delivery book in which the necessary entries for the despatch of this letter is marked as Ext. M23. He offered this letter on 5-6-1968 to 3 persons and they refused to receive the same. He has also tendered evidence before the enquiry officer. In cross examination it is stated that the despatch clerk has entrusted him with the covers. Firstly it was offered to WW1 and then to the offers.

15. MW2 is the managing director. He started the factory at Trippunithura in 1953 and closed it in 1968. The closure notice is marked as Ext. M17 and notice pay and compensation was given to all workers present on that day. These 4 workers have not received the retrenchment compensations.

16. The union has a contention that the management dismissed Sri Venugopalan from service without sufficient reasons and it amounts to victimisation. On these grounds they say that the dismissal has to be set aside and an order should be passed to reinstate him. The management has produced the enquiry proceedings and the same is marked as Ext. M21 series. The charge against him is contained in the notice issued to him. There is no case that he has not received the charges or the notice regarding the enquiry. He has taken part in the enquiry and from the enquiry proceedings it is seen that he has cross-examined the management witnesses and he has also examined his own witnesses. There is nothing on record to show that there was anything improper in the conduct of the enquiry. The union has also not pointed out anything sufficient to conclude that there was anything improper in the conduct of the enquiry. So I find that the enquiry was conducted properly. Regarding the charge the witness has elaborately stated the circumstances under which he refused to accept this letter. According to him that letter contained some directions issued to him by the managing director in his capacity as the representative of the workers. According to him he has not even taken part in the discussions or the meeting at which the workers decided to elect himself and 4 others as their representatives. He would say that he has not done anything as the representative of the workers. The management refers to Ext. M6, M7, M8 and M9. Ext M7 is the copy of the letter addressed to the management containing the signatures of a number of workers working there. This letter intimates the management that the workers have elected Sri Venugopal and 4 others as their representatives. This letter is issued in pursuance to Ext. M6 by which the management asked the workers to elect a committee of workers for discussion and settlement of problems connected with the workers. Ext. M8 is the notice by which the management informed the workers that they have recognised these 5 workers as the representative of workers. This is dated 12-4-1968 and on the same day these workers as representatives entered into an agreement with the management regarding the Vishu advance. This is Ext M9, and the copy produced in court shows that this worker also had signed this agreement. In view of these documents I find that the workers had during the year 1968 elected or authorised some of these workers to act on their behalf and the management has by their letter accepted the same. For some time these workers had worked there as the representatives and some sort of settlement or agreement was also arrived at between the management and the workers. So the contention of this worker that he has not taken part in any of the deliberations cannot be accepted. He would say that there was some agitation going on during the period immediately prior to the dismissal and the management wanted this worker to work in a particular way as the representative of the workers and that too against the interests of the Union.

17. This worker says that he never acted as the representative of the workers. He also says that he cannot say anything about such a committee. But this is the evidence of WW2 to show that during some particular period

he worked with others as the representative of workers. He also took part in the negotiations which ended with Ext. M9. The copy produced in the court shows that Mr. Venugopal also participated in the meeting and he has signed the agreement. He has no case that the copy produced in court is as in correct one. Hence it has to be concluded that he acted as a representative of the workers for some time. If this evidence is believed then it has also to be concluded that during this particular period the union also was functioning. Both parties have not come out with the reasons for such an attitude on the part of both parties. The management persued this matter further and they sought some clarifications and that is seen from Ext. W10. On these grounds I find that Mr. Venugopal and 4 others agreed to work for sometime as the representatives of workers notwithstanding the fact that a union was functioning there. If this is the position I do not find any reasons for the refusal of the letter from the management, even if it contained directions regarding the role to be played by him in the dispute. There was no harm to be casued by receiving that letter because the former occasions he had acted as a representative. If there had been any ground for such fears then they could have stated that. The worker has not made it clear the troubles, difficulties or other grave situation which he would have faced if he had received this letter. In the absence of this aspect it cannot be concluded that the refusal in any way justified.

18. According to the Management that letter contained direction or rather according to them it was an order to him to proceed to some place to rectify the defects found in some apparatus or instruments delivered to a party by this management. This worker admits that on former occasions he had gone to such places for onstation work. This letter is dated 29-5-1968. It is argued by the learned counsel for the Union that if the letter was of such an urgent nature there would not have been so much of delay in handing over this letter. This is not sufficient to conclude that the letter contained the communications regarding the role to be played by this worker in the dispute between the workers and the management. As already stated, in the absence of anything to suggest the peril to which this worker would have been pushed by accepting this letter I find that the non acceptance of this letter by worker cannot be justified in any way.

19. Then the next question is whether the punishment awarded to the worker is proportionate to the offence or misconduct committed by him. For some reason the management also would have thought like this before they issued the dismissal order and on that ground probably they have issued a few letters to this worker after the enquiry officer had arrived at the conclusion that the worker is guilty of the charges levelled against him. The first letter is dated 6-7-1968 by which they sought the explanation from this worker and his explanation is dated 10-7-1968. Another letter is also sent by the management dated 19-7-1968 thereby this worker was given another chance and he was also asked to meet the managing Director personally and the reply is dated 23-7-1968. From another letter dated 25-7-1968 addressed by the management to the worker it is seen that the management wanted the worker to realise his misconduct and the appologise

for the same. On the basis of these letters I find that the management had given sufficient opportunity to the worker to realise the error committed by him and they were also prepared to condone the same provided the worker was prepared to appologise. It is not for me to say whether the worker should have appologised or not but on the basis of the facts and documents made available in this case it is found that the management had given sufficient opportunity to the worker to correct the error committed by him. So I find that the worker is not entitled to any relief in this case.

20. The next question is with regard to the right or relief to which the other workers are entitled. The Union's case is that they have been retrenched without sufficient reason. The management would say that they are all masons and when there was lack of work in the refractory section they had no alternative, but to retrench these workers. The management relies on the evidence of MWs 1 and 2 and also on a few documents produced by them. Ext. M24 shows the turn over of the factory at Thrippunithura. This shows the figures for 1964-65 to July, 1968. There was some reduction in the year 1968. During the first year i. e. 1964-65 their production per month on an average came to goods worth about 2·23538 lakhs. There after it never reached that figure. It began to decrease gradually and in July, 1968 the figure has come down to 0·68727 lakhs. As against these figures the union has not given any explanation. They do not dispute the correctness of these figures. According to the management this is the main reason why they retrenched these workers. The Union has not set up a case that the management has not adhered to the principle of "Last come first go" in the case of these workers. It is also seen from the evidence that the management closed down the establishment after retrenchment though it is admitted that they have started it again as an entirely different unit. It is seen that almost all workers have accepted the closure compensation. On the basis of these facts I find that the management retrenched these workers only because of lack of orders. In view of these facts I find that these workers are not entitled to any relief. But in case they have not received any retrenchment compensation they can get the same from the management.

21. I pass this award as stated above and this award shall come into force on the expiry of 30 days after its publication in the Government Gazette.

R. K. Venu Nayar,
Industrial Tribunal, Calicut.

Appendix

Documents marked on the side of the Union.

Ext. W1. Letter dated 29-5-1968 from the Management to Sri P. Venugopalan and 4 others.

W2. Copy of memorandum of settlement dated 11-8-1968.

W3. Copy of letter dated 11-6-1968 to the District Labour Officer, Alwaye & 3 others from the management

W4. Copy of Ex. W1 dated 29-5-1968

Ext. W5. Copy of letter dated 5-6-1969 from the management to Sri. Venugopalan

W6. Copy of reply dated 5-6-1968 from Venugopalan to the management

W7. Copy of latter dated 10-7-1968 from Venugopalan to the management

W8. Copy showcause notice dated 19-7-1968 from the management to Sri. P. Venugopalan

W9. Copy of dismissal order dated 30-7-1968 issued to Sri. Venugopalan by the management

W10. Copy of letter dated 23-8-1969 of the Assistant Labour Officer, II Circle, Ernakulam

W11. Copy of retrenchment notice of the management 9-8-1969.

Documents marked on the side of the management

M1. Copy notice dated 17-1-1968 issued to M/s M. K. Amen & others

M2. Copy of notice dated 22-4-1968 issued to M/s V. K. Sankara Menon & others

M3. Copy of notice dated 13-5-1968 issued to M/s. P. B. Ramachandran & others

M4. Copy of letter dated 25-4-1968 from the union to the management

M5 Copy of memorandum of settlement dated 4-7-1965.

M6. Copy of notice dated 11-4-1968 by the management to the workers

M7. Copy of letter dated 12-4-1968 from M. R. Raveendran and 58 other workers to the management

M7. (a) Original

M8. Copy of notice dated 12-4-1968 given by the management to the workers regarding the election of their representatives

M9. Copy of agreement dat d 12-t-1968

M10. Copy of notice dated 18-6-1968 to the workmen about the neglect of work, go-slow etc.

M11. Copy of notice dated 8-8-1968 given to M/s. K. S. Antony & others by the management

M12. Copy of notice dated 9-8-1968 of retrenchment given to M/s. K. S. Antony & others

M13. Copy of notice dated 10-8-1968 of retrenchment given to K. K. Ramakrishnan and 30 other workers by the management

M14. Copy of notice dated 26-8-1968 given to the workers by the management appealing to the workmen to withdraw the strike

M15. Copy of letter dated 26-8-1968 of the management to the Asst. Labour Officer, II Circle, Ernakulam

M16. Copy of letter dated 10-9-1968 of the management to Sri. K. M Paramu and 29 others

M17. Copy of letter dated 31-10-1968 of the management to Sri. P. K. Vasudevan & 47 others
M18. Copy of letter dated 10-11-1968 from the union to the management
M19. Reply dated 19-11-1968 of the management to the union
M20. Office copy of letter dated 29-5-1968 of the management to Sri P. Venugopalan
M21. Enquiry proceedings in respect of the enquiry conducted against P. Venugopalan
M22. Undelivered local cover addressed to P. Venugopalan with the endorsement of M. Krishnan Nair dated 5-6-1968
M23. Local delivery book
M24. Statement showing the turn over of the factory at Thrippunithura which was closed on 30-9-1968
M25. Copy of G. O. Rt. 873/70/LSWD dated 9-6-1970 withdrawing the prosecution case.

Witnesses examined on the side of the union:

WW1. P. Venugopalan
WW2. V. K. Sankaran
WW3. K. X. Verghese

Witnesses examined on the side of the management:

MW1. M. Krishnan Nair
MW2. C. G. Balakrishnan

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Law Department

NOTIFICATION

No. 17309/B2/70/Law. *Dated, Trivandrum, 2nd January* 1971.

The following Act of Parliament, published in a Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II–Section 1, dated the 4th December, 1970 is hereby republished for general information. The Bill as passed by the Houses of Parliament received the assent of the President on the 1st December 1970.

By order of the Governor,
P. GOPALAKRISHNA WARRIER,
Law Secretary.

THE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE CESS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1970 (40 of 1970)

An

ACT

further to amend the Agricultural Produce Cess Act, 1940.

Be it enacted by Parliament in the Twenty-first Year of the Republic of India as follows:—

1. *Short title.*—This Act may be called the Agricultural Produce Cess (Amendment) Act 1970.

2. *Amendment of section* 2.—In section 2 of the Agricultural Produce Cess Act, 1940 (27 of 1940) (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), for clause (a), the following clause shall be substituted, namely:—

'(a) "Collector" means a Collector of Customs as defined in clause (8) of section 2 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962); and'.

3. *Amendment of section* 5.—In section 5 of the principal Act, for the words "The Central Board of Revenue", the words and figures "The Central Board of Excise and Customs constituted under the Central Boards of Revenue Act, 1963 (54 of 1963)" shall be substituted.

4. *Insertion of new sections 5A and 5B.*—After section 5 of the principal Act, the following sections shall be inserted, namely:—

"5A. *Certain provisions of the Customs Act,* 1962 *to apply.*—The provisions of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), and the rules and regulations made thereunder, including those relating to refunds and exemptions from duty, shall so far as may be, apply in relation to the

levy and collection of customs duty on all articles included in the Schedule as they apply in relation to the levy and collection of duty payable to the Central Government under that Act.

5B. *Penalties.*—(1) Whoever—

(a) evades the payment of any customs duty under this Act, or

(b) fails to furnish any information which it is his duty to furnish or furnishes information which is false in material particulars or which he does not believe to be true, or

(c) obstructs the Collector or any other officer in the performance of his duties under this Act or any rules made thereunder,

shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months, or with fine which may extend to two thousand rupees, or with both.

(2) Any court trying an offence under this Act may direct that any article specified in the Schedule in respect of which it is satisfied that an offence punishable under this Act has been committed shall be forfeited to the Central Government and may also direct that all packages, coverings or receptacles in which such article is contained and every vessel or other conveyance used in carrying such article shall be forfeited to the Central Government.".

5. *Amendment of section* 7.—In sub-section (1) of section 7 of the principal Act, for the words "the representatives of the Central Legislature", the words "the Members of Parliament" shall be substituted.

6. *Amendment of section* 9.—In section 9 of the principal Act, for sub-section (3), the following sub-section shall be substituted, namely:—

"(3) Every rule made under this Act shall be laid, as soon as may be after it is made, before each House of Parliament while it is in session for a total period of thirty days which may be comprised in one session or in two successive sessions, and if, before the expiry of the session in which it is so laid or the successive sessions aforesaid, both Houses agree in making any modification in the rule or both Houses agree that the rule should not be made, the rule shall thereafter have effect only in such modified form or be of no effect, as the case may be; so, however, that any such modification or annulment shall be without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done under that rule.".

7. *Amendment of the Schedule.*—In the Schedule to the principal Act, for item 21, the following item shall be substituted, namely:—

"21. Sheep's or lamb's wool and animal hair, whether or not scoured or carded.".

കേരള ഗവൺമെന്റ്

ലാ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റ്

പരസ്യം

നമ്പർ 14461/എച്ച്2/70/ലാ.

തിരുവനന്തപുരം, 1970 ഡിസംബർ 2./
1892 അഗ്രഹായണം 11.

കേരളസംസ്ഥാന നിയമസഭയുടെ താഴെപ്പറയുന്ന ആക്റ്റ് പൊതുജനങ്ങളുടെ അറിവിനായി ഇതിനാൽ പ്രസിദ്ധപ്പെടുത്തുന്നു. നിയമസഭ പാസാക്കിയ പ്രകാരമുള്ള ബില്ലിന് 1970 നവംബർ 28-ാം തീയതി പ്രസിഡന്റിന്റെ അനുമതി ലഭിക്കുകയുണ്ടായി.

ഗവർണ്ണരുടെ ഉത്തരവുപ്രകാരം,
പി. വി. രാമചന്ദ്രൻ,
അഡീഷണൽ ലാ സെക്രട്ടറി.

1970-ലെ 29-ാം ആക്റ്റ്

1970-ലെ കേരള കർഷക-കുടിയാൻ (താൽക്കാലിക സംരക്ഷണ) ആക്റ്റ്.

ചില വിഭാഗം ആളുകളുടെ കൈവശമുള്ള ഭൂമികളെ സംബന്ധിച്ച അവകാശങ്ങൾ തീരുമാനിക്കുന്നതിന് വേണ്ടിയുള്ള വ്യവഹാരങ്ങളും മറ്റു നടപടികളും നിറുത്തി വെയ്ക്കുന്നതിനും, പാട്ടക്കുടിശ്ശിക വസൂലാക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള നടപടികൾക്കെതിരായി കുടിയാന്മാർക്ക് താൽക്കാലിക സംരക്ഷണം നൽകുന്നതിനും, അതിന് ആനുഷംഗികമായ കാര്യങ്ങൾക്കും വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്യുന്ന ഒരു ആക്റ്റ്.

പീഠിക.—ചില വിഭാഗം ആളുകളുടെ കൈവശമുള്ള ഭൂമികളെ സംബന്ധിച്ച അവകാശങ്ങൾ തീരുമാനിക്കുന്നതിന് വേണ്ടിയുള്ള വ്യവഹാരങ്ങളും മറ്റു നടപടികളും നിറുത്തി വെക്കുന്നതിനും പാട്ടക്കുടിശ്ശിക വസൂലാക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള നടപടികൾക്കെതിരായി കുടിയാന്മാർക്ക് താൽക്കാലിക സംരക്ഷണം നൽകുന്നതിനും അതിന് ആനുഷംഗികമായ കാര്യങ്ങൾക്കും വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്യുന്നത് യുക്തമായിരിക്കയാൽ;

ഇൻഡ്യൻ റിപ്പബ്ലിക്കിന്റെ ഇരുപത്തിയൊന്നാം സംവത്സരത്തിൽ താഴെപ്പറയും പ്രകാരം നിയമമുണ്ടാക്കട്ടെ,—

1. ചുരുക്കപ്പേരും, വ്യാപ്തിയും, ആരംഭവും, കാലാവധിയും.—(1) ഈ ആക്റ്റിന് 1970-ലെ കേരള കർഷക-കുടിയാൻ (താൽക്കാലിക സംരക്ഷണ ആക്റ്റ്) എന്ന് പേർ പറയാം.

(2) ഈ ആക്റ്റിൽ സ്പഷ്ടമായി വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്തിരിക്കുന്ന പ്രകാരമൊഴികെ ഇതിന് കേരളസംസ്ഥാനം മുഴുവൻ വ്യാപ്തിയുണ്ടായിരിക്കുന്നതാണ്.

(3) ഇത് ഉടനടി പ്രാബല്യത്തിൽ വരുന്നതും 1971 ഒക്ടോബർ 16-ാം തീയതി പ്രാബല്യം ഇല്ലാതായിത്തീരുന്നതുമാണ്.

(4) ഈ ആക്റ്റിന് പ്രാബല്യം ഇല്ലാതായിത്തീരുമ്പോൾ കേരളസംസ്ഥാന നിയമസഭയുടെ ഒരു ആക്റ്റ് മൂലം ഈ ആക്റ്റ് റദ്ദാക്കിയിരുന്നാലെന്നപോലെ വ്യാഖ്യാനവും സാമാന്യ വാചക ബന്ധങ്ങളും സംബന്ധിച്ച 1125-ലെ ആക്റ്റ് (1125-ലെ VII) 4-ാം വകുപ്പിലെ വ്യവസ്ഥകൾ ബാധകമാകുന്നതാണ്.

2. വ്യാഖ്യാനം.—ഈ ആക്റ്റിൽ ഉപയോഗിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന വാക്കുകൾക്കും പ്രയോഗങ്ങൾക്കും 1963-ലെ കേരള ഭൂപരിഷ്കരണ ആക്റ്റിൽ (1964-ലെ 1) അവയ്ക്കു യഥാക്രമം നൽകിയിരിക്കുന്ന അർത്ഥം ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കുന്നതാണ്.

3. ചില വിഭാഗം ആളുകളുടെ കൈവശമുള്ള ഭൂമികളെ സംബന്ധിച്ച് അവകാശങ്ങൾ തീരുമാനിക്കുന്നതിനു വേണ്ടിയുള്ള വ്യവഹാരങ്ങളും, മറ്റു നടപടികളും നിർത്തിവയ്ക്കൽ.—(1) മറ്റേതെങ്കിലും നിയമത്തിലോ, ഏതെങ്കിലും കോടതിയുടെ ഏതെങ്കിലും വിധിന്യായത്തിലോ, വിധിയിലോ, ഉത്തരവിലോ വിപരീതമായി എന്തു തന്നെ അടങ്ങിയിരുന്നാലും ഈ ആക്റ്റ് നടപ്പായി വരുമ്പോൾ ഏതെങ്കിലും കോടതിയുടെയോ, ലാന്റ് ട്രൈബ്യൂണലിന്റെയോ, അപ്പീലധികാരസ്ഥാനത്തിന്റെയോ, മറ്റധികാരസ്ഥാനത്തിന്റെയോ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്റെയോ മുമ്പാകെ ഏതെങ്കിലും ഭൂമി സംബന്ധിച്ച ഏതെങ്കിലും അപേക്ഷയോ, അപ്പീലോ, റിവിഷനോ, പുനഃപരിശോധനയോ, അഥവാ ഏതെങ്കിലും വിധിയോ ഉത്തരവോ നടത്തുന്നതു സംബന്ധിച്ച നടപടിയോ (അതിന് ആനുഷംഗികമോ സഹായകമോ ആയ നടപടികൾ ഉൾപ്പെടെ) മറ്റേതെങ്കിലും നടപടിയോ തീർപ്പു കാണാതെയിരിക്കുകയോ അഥവാ അങ്ങനെ നടപ്പായി വന്നശേഷം ബോധിപ്പിക്കുകയോ, ഫയൽ ചെയ്യുകയോ തുടങ്ങുകയോ ചെയ്യുകയും, അതിലെ ഏതെങ്കിലും കക്ഷി 1969-ലെ കേരള ഭൂപരിഷ്കരണ (ഭേദഗതി) ആക്റ്റ് നടപ്പായി വന്നപ്പോൾ അങ്ങനെയുള്ള ഭൂമി തന്റെ കൈവശം വെച്ചിരുന്നുവെന്ന് കാണിച്ചുള്ള സ്റ്റേറ്റുമെന്റ് ഫയൽ ചെയ്തിരിക്കുകയോ, ഫയൽ ചെയ്യുകയോ ചെയ്യുകയും,—

(എ) അങ്ങനെയുള്ള ഭൂമി മലബാറിൽ സ്ഥിതി ചെയ്യുകയും അയാളോ, അവകാശബന്ധമുള്ള അയാളുടെ മുൻഗാമിയോ 1967 ഏപ്രിൽ 11-ാം തീയതിക്കു തൊട്ടു മുമ്പുള്ള പന്ത്രണ്ടു വർഷക്കാലത്തിനകം രണ്ടു വർഷത്തിൽ കുറയാത്ത കാലത്തേക്ക് താൻ ഒരു കുടിയാനാണെന്ന് ആത്മാർത്ഥമായി വിശ്വസിച്ചുകൊണ്ട്, അങ്ങനെയുള്ള ഭൂമി കൈവശം വച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരുന്നുവെങ്കിലോ അഥവാ,

(ബി) അങ്ങനെ കൈവശം വെച്ചിരുന്നത് പാട്ടാധാരമെന്നുദ്ദേശിക്കുന്ന രജിസ്റ്റർ ചെയ്ത ആധാരത്തിന്റെ അടിസ്ഥാനത്തിലായിരിക്കുകയും അയാളോ അവകാശബന്ധമുള്ള അയാളുടെ മുൻഗാമിയോ പ്രസ്തുത ആധാരത്തിന്റെ അടിസ്ഥാനത്തിൽ 1957 ഏപ്രിൽ 11-ാം തീയതി അങ്ങനെയുള്ള ഭൂമി കൈവശം വെയ്ക്കുകയും, ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളപക്ഷമോ അങ്ങനെയുള്ള അതതു സംഗതിപോലെ, കോടതിയോ, ലാന്റ് ട്രൈബ്യൂണലോ അപ്പീലധികാരസ്ഥാനമോ മറ്റധികാരസ്ഥാനമോ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥനോ അതതു സംഗതി പോലെ ആ വ്യവഹാരമോ, റിവിഷനോ പുനഃപരിശോധനയോ മറ്റു നടപടികളോ തുടർന്ന് നടത്താൻ പാടില്ലാത്തതാകുന്നു.

(2). (1)-ാം ഉപവകുപ്പിൽ അടങ്ങിയിട്ടുള്ള യാതൊന്നുംതന്നെ ആ ഉപവകുപ്പിൽ പറയുന്ന സ്റ്റേറ്റുമെന്റ് ഫയൽചെയ്തിരിക്കുകയോ ഫയൽ ചെയ്യുകയോ ചെയ്തിരിക്കുന്ന കക്ഷി ആ സ്റ്റേറ്റുമെന്റ് സംബന്ധിക്കുന്ന ഭൂമിയിലെ ഒരു കുടിയാനാണെന്ന് സമ്മതിക്കുന്ന ഏതെങ്കിലും സംഗതിയിൽ ബാധകമായിരിക്കുന്നതല്ല.

4. പാട്ടക്കുടിശ്ശികയ്ക്കുള്ള വ്യവഹാരങ്ങൾ, അപേക്ഷകൾ മുതലായവ നിർത്തിവെയ്ക്കൽ.(1)— മറ്റേതെങ്കിലും നിയമത്തിലോ, ഏതെങ്കിലും കരാറിലോ, ഏതെങ്കിലും കോടതിയുടെയോ, ലാന്റ് ട്രൈബ്യൂണലിന്റെയോ, ഏതെങ്കിലും വിധിന്യായത്തിലോ, വിധിയിലോ, ഉത്തരവിലോ, വിപരീതമായി എന്തുതന്നെ അടങ്ങിയിരുന്നാലും ഈ ആക്റ്റ് നടപ്പായി വരുമ്പോഴും നടപ്പായി വരുന്നതു മുതൽക്കും,

(എ) 1968 മെയ്മാസം 1-ാം തീയതിക്കു മുമ്പ് ഏതെങ്കിലും കൈവശക്കുടിയാനോ, വാരം ഭൂമിയുടെ ഭാഗത്തെയോ സംബന്ധിച്ച് കൊടുക്കേണ്ടതായിരുന്ന കുടിശ്ശിക വസൂലാക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള യാതൊരു വ്യവഹാരമോ, അപേക്ഷയോ, മറ്റു നടപടിയോ, അല്ലെങ്കിൽ

(ബി) അപ്രകാരമുള്ള പാട്ടക്കുടിസ്സിക വസൂലാക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള വിധിയോ, ഉത്തരവോ നടത്തുന്നതിനുള്ള യാതൊരപേക്ഷയോ, നടപടിയോ അഥവാ അതിന് ആനുഷംഗികമോ, സഹായകമോ ആയ മററപേക്ഷയോ, നടപടിയോ ഏതെങ്കിലും കോടതിയിലോ ലാൻഡ് ട്രൈബ്യൂണലിലോ സ്വീകാര്യമായിരിക്കുന്നതല്ലാത്തതും, ഈ ആക്റ്റ് നടപ്പായി വരുമ്പോൾ കോടതികളിലോ ലാൻഡ് ട്രൈബ്യൂണലുകളിലോ തീർപ്പാകാതെയിരിക്കുന്ന അങ്ങനെയുള്ള പാട്ടക്കുടിസ്സിക വസൂലാക്കുന്നതിനുവേണ്ടിയുള്ള എല്ലാ വ്യവഹാരങ്ങളും അപേക്ഷകളും മററു നടപടികളും അങ്ങനെയുള്ള പാട്ടക്കുടിസ്സിക വസൂലാക്കുന്നതിനുവേണ്ടിയുള്ള വിധികളോ ഉത്തരവുകളോ നടത്തുന്നതിനുവേണ്ടിയുള്ള എല്ലാ നടപടികളും, അതിനു ആനുഷംഗികമോ സഹായകമോ ആയ മററു നടപടികളും നിറുത്തി വയ്ക്കേണ്ടതാകുന്നു.

(2) ഈ ആക്റ്റ് നടപ്പായി വരുമ്പോൾ ഏതെങ്കിലും കോടതിയുടെയോ, അപ്പീലധികാരസ്ഥാനത്തിന്റെയോ മുമ്പാകെ തീർപ്പാകാതെയിരിക്കുന്നതും, കൈവശക്കുടിയായ്മ, കൈവശക്കുടിയുടെ ഭാഗത്തായാ സംബന്ധിച്ച് 1968 മേയ് മാസം 1-ാം തീയതിക്കു മുമ്പു കൊടുക്കേണ്ടതായിത്തീർന്ന കുടിസ്സിക സംബന്ധിച്ച വിധികൾക്കോ ഉത്തരവുകൾക്കോ എതിരായുള്ളതുമായ എല്ലാ അപ്പീലുകളും, അങ്ങനെയുള്ള പാട്ടക്കുടിസ്സിക സംബന്ധിച്ച വിധികൾക്കോ ഉത്തരവുകൾക്കോ എതിരായുള്ള എല്ലാ റിവിഷനുകളും നിറുത്തിവയ്ക്കേണ്ടതും യാതൊരു കോടതിയോ അപ്പീലധികാരസ്ഥാനമോ അങ്ങനെ നടപ്പായി വന്നശേഷം ബോധിപ്പിച്ച അങ്ങനെയുള്ള ഏതെങ്കിലും അപ്പീലോ റിവിഷനോ തുടർന്ന് നടത്താൻ പാടില്ലാത്തതുമാകുന്നു.

5. ചില അപേക്ഷകൾ നിറുത്തിവെയ്ക്കൽ.—(1) 1963-ലെ കേരള ഭൂപരിഷ്കരണ ആക്റ്റ് (1964-ലെ 1) 13 സി എന്ന വകുപ്പിൽ എന്തുതന്നെ അടങ്ങിയിരുന്നാലും, ഈ ആക്റ്റ് നടപ്പായി വരുമ്പോൾ ഏതെങ്കിലും കോടതി മുമ്പാകെ തീർപ്പാകാതെയിരിക്കുന്നതും, ആ വകുപ്പു പ്രകാരം ബോധിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതോ ബോധിപ്പിച്ചതായി ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതോ ആയ ഏതെങ്കിലും അപേക്ഷ സംബന്ധിച്ചുള്ളതായ എല്ലാ നടപടികളും നിറുത്തി വയ്ക്കേണ്ടതാകുന്നു.

(2) ഏതെങ്കിലും കോടതിയുടെ ഏതെങ്കിലും വിധിന്യായത്തിലോ, ഉത്തരവിലോ വിപരീതമായി എന്തുതന്നെ അടങ്ങിയിരുന്നാലും ഈ ആക്റ്റ് നടപ്പായി വരുമ്പോൾ 1963-ലെ കേരള ഭൂപരിഷ്കരണ ആക്റ്റ് (1964-ലെ 1) 45 എ എന്ന വകുപ്പ് 2-ാം ഉപവകുപ്പു പ്രകാരം ബോധിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതോ, ബോധിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതായി ഉദ്ദേശിക്കപ്പെട്ടതോ ആയതും, ഏതെങ്കിലും കോടതിയുടെയോ ലാൻഡ് ട്രൈബ്യൂണലിന്റെയോ മുമ്പാകെ തീർപ്പാകാതെയിരിക്കുന്നതുമായ എല്ലാ നടപടികളും നിറുത്തി വയ്ക്കേണ്ടതാകുന്നു.

6. കാലഹരണം.—ഈ ആക്റ്റ് പ്രകാരം നിരോധിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള വ്യവഹാരങ്ങളും അപേക്ഷകളും മററു നടപടികളും ബോധിപ്പിക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള കാലഹരണം കണക്കാക്കുമ്പോൾ ഈ ആക്റ്റ് പ്രകാരവും 1970-ലെ കേരള പാട്ടക്കുടിസ്സിക വസൂലാക്കൽ നിറുത്തിവെയ്ക്കൽ ഓർഡിനൻസ് (1970-ലെ 18) പ്രകാരവും അപ്രകാരമുള്ള വ്യവഹാരങ്ങളും അപേക്ഷകളും മററു നടപടികളും നിരോധിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള കാലം ഒഴിവാക്കേണ്ടതാണ്.

7. ഒഴിവാക്കൽ.—1963-ലെ കേരള ഭൂപരിഷ്കരണ ആക്റ്റ്, (1964-ലെ 1) 3-ാം വകുപ്പുപ്രകാരം പ്രസ്തുത ആക്റ്റിലെ വ്യവസ്ഥകളിൽ നിന്നും ഒഴിവാക്കിയിട്ടുള്ള ഏതെങ്കിലും പാട്ടമോ കുടിയായ്മയോ സംബന്ധിച്ച് ഈ ആക്റ്റിലുള്ള യാതൊന്നും തന്നെ ബാധകമായിരിക്കുന്നതല്ല.

8. റദ്ദാക്കലും ഒഴിവാക്കലും.—(1) 1970-ലെ കേരള പാട്ടക്കുടിശ്ശിക വസൂലാക്കൽനിർത്തിവയ്ക്കൽ ഓർഡിനൻസ് (1970-ലെ 18) ഇതിനാൽ റദ്ദാക്കിയിരിക്കുന്നു.

(2) അങ്ങനെ റദ്ദാക്കിയിരുന്നാൽകൂടി പ്രസ്തുത ഓർഡിനൻസ് മൂലം ചെയ്ത ഏതെങ്കിലും കാര്യമോ, എടുത്ത ഏതെങ്കിലും നടപടിയോ ഈ ആക്റ്റ് 1970 ഒക്ടോബർ 17-ാം തീയതി പ്രാബല്യത്തിൽ വന്നിരുന്നാലെന്നപോലെ ഈ ആക്റ്റ് പ്രകാരം ചെയ്തതോ, എടുത്തതോ ആയി കരുതേണ്ടതാകുന്നു.

(A true translation)

C. H. Kunhiraman,
Head Translator.

கேரள அரசு

சட்டத் துறை

விளம்பரம்

எண். 11808/எப் 4/70/சட்டம்.

திருவனந்தபுரம், 1970 நவம்பர் 27 / 1892 அக்ரஹாயணம் 6

கேரள மாநிலச் சட்டப்பேரவையின் கீழ்க்காணும் சட்டம் பொது தகவலுக்கென இதனால் பிரசுரிக்கப்படுகிறது. சட்டசபையினால் நிறைவேற்றப்பட்ட மசோதாவுக்கு 1970 நவம்பர் 26-ம் நாளன்று மாநிலத்தலைவரின் அங்கீகாரம் கிடைக்கப்பெற்றது.

மாநிலத்தலைவர் ஆணைப்படி,

பி. வி. ராமச்சந்திரன்,
சட்ட இணைச் செயலாளர்.

The Calicut University (Amendment) Act, 1970.

1970-ன் 12-வது சட்டம்

1970-ன் காலிக்கட் பல்கலைக்கழக (திருத்த) சட்டம்

1968-ன் காலிக்கட் பல்கலைக்கழக சட்டத்தினைத் திருத்துவதற்கான ஒரு சட்டம்.

பீடிகை.—இதன் பின்னர் வரும் நோக்கங்களின் பொருட்டு, 1968-ன் காலிக்கட் பல்கலைக்கழகச் சட்டத்தினைத் திருத்துவது உசிதமானதையால்;

இந்தியக் குடியரசின் இருபத்தொன்றாவது வருடம் இது பின்வருமாறு சட்டமாக்கப்படட்டும்:—

1. சுருக்கத்தலைப்பு.—இச்சட்டம், 1970-ன் காலிக்கட் பல்கலைக்கழக (திருத்த) சட்டம் என அழைக்கப்படலாம்.

2. பிரிவு 50-ன் திருத்தம்.—(இதன் பிறகு முதற் சட்டமென குறிப்பிடப்படும்) 1968-ன் காலிக்கட் பல்கலைக்கழகச் சட்டத்தின் (1968-ன் 24) 50-வது பிரிவில் "இரண்டு வருடங்கள்" எனும் சொற்களுக்குப்பதில் "மூன்று வருடங்கள்" எனும் சொற்கள் இடப்படவேண்டும்.

3. தள்ளுபடியும் தவிர்ப்பும்.—(1) 1970-ன் காலிக்கட் பல்கலைக்கழக அவசரச் சட்டம் (1970-ன் 16) இதனால் தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்படுகிறது.

(2) அவ்வாறு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்ட போதிலும் மேற்சொன்ன அவசரச் சட்டத்தினால் திருத்தப்பட்டவாறான முதற் சட்டத்தின் கீழ் செய்யப்பட்ட எதுவும் அல்லது மேற்கொள்ளப்பட்ட எந்த நடவடிக்கையும் 1970 செப்டம்பர் 9-ம் நாள் அன்றும் அன்றிலிருந்தும் இச்சட்டம் ஆரம்பித்ததாகக் கொண்டு இச்சட்டத்தினால் திருத்தப்பட்டவாறான முதற் சட்டத்தின் கீழ் செய்யப்பட்டதாக அல்லது மேற்கொள்ளப்பட்டதாகக் கருதப்படவேண்டும்.

கேரள அரசு

சட்டத் துறை

விளம்பரம்

எண். 5837-எம் 4/70/சட்டம்.

திருவனந்தபுரம், 1970 ஏப்ரல் 30 / 1892 வைசாக 10

1970 ஏப்ரல் 30-ம் நாள் கேரள மாநிலத் தலைவரால் அவசர விளம்பர அறிவிக்கை செய்யப்பட்ட கீழ்க்காணும் அவசரச் சட்டம் பொதுத் தகவலுக்கென இதனால் பிரசுரம் செய்யப்படுகிறது.

மாநிலத் தலைவரின் ஆணைப்படி,
பி. வி. இராமச்சந்திரன்,
சட்ட இலாகச் செயலாளர்.

The Kerala University (Second Amendment) Ordinance, 1970

1970-ன் 3-வது அவசரச் சட்டம்

1970-ன் கேரள பல்கலைக் கழக (இரண்டாவது திருத்த) அவசரச் சட்டம்.

இந்தியக் குடியரசின் இருபத்தொன்றாவது வருடத்தில் கேரள மாநிலத் தலைவரால் அவசர விளம்பர அறிவிக்கை செய்யப்பட்டது.

1969-ன் கேரள பல்கலைக் கழகச் சட்டத்தினைத் திருத்துவதற்கான ஒரு அவசரச் சட்டம்.

பீடிகை.—கேரள மாநிலச் சட்டசபைக் கூட்டத்தொடரில் இல்லாததாலும், உடனடி நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பதற்குத் தேவையான சூழ்நிலை ஏற்பட்டுள்ளது என்று கேரள மாநிலத்தலைவர் திருத்தியுறுவதாலும்,

இப்போது ஆகவே, இந்திய அரசியலமைப்பின் 213-வது விதியின் உட்பிரிவு (1)-ஆல் வழங்கப்பட்ட அதிகாரங்களைப் பயன்படுத்தி, கேரள மாநிலத் தலைவர் பின்வரும் அவசரச் சட்டத்தினை விளம்பர அறிவிக்கை செய்ய இசைந்துள்ளார்.

1. சுருக்கத் தலைப்பு மற்றும் ஆரம்பம்.—(1) இவ் அவசரச் சட்டம் 1970-ன் கேரள பல்கலைக் கழக (இரண்டாவது திருத்த) அவசர சட்டம் என அழைக்கப்படலாம்.

(2) இது உடனடி அமலுக்கு வரும்.

2. பிரிவு 10-ன் திருத்தம்.—1969-ன் கேரள பல்கலைக் கழகச் சட்டத்தின் (1969-ன் 9-வது சட்டம்) பிரிவு 10-ன் துணைப்பிரிவு (5)-ல் "துணைப்பிரிவு (3)-ல் அடங்கியுள்ள எதுவும் எவ்வாறிருந்த போதிலும் வேந்தர் அனுமதிக்கலாம்" எனும் சொற்களுக்குப் பதில் "துணைப்பிரிவு (3) அல்லது துணைப்பிரிவு (15)-ல் அடங்கியுள்ள எதுவும் எவ்வாறிருந்த போதிலும், அதது காரியத்திலாவதுபோல், வேந்தர் அல்லது அரசு அனுமதிக்கலாம்" எனும் சொற்கள் சேர்க்கப்பட வேண்டும்.

வி. விஸ்வநாதன்,
மாநிலத் தலைவர்.

G. 2586

கேரள அரசு

சட்டத் துறை

விளம்பரம்

எண்: 13026-ஏ 2/70/சட்டம்.

திருவனந்தபுரம்—1970 நவம்பர் 30 / 1393 அக்ரஹாயணம் 9

கேரள மாநில சட்டப்பேரவையின்கீழ்க்காணும் சட்டம் பொதுத் தகவலுக்கென இதனால் பிரசுரம் செய்யப்படுகிறது. சட்டசபையால் நிறைவேற்றப்பட்ட மசோதாவிற்கு, 1970 நவம்பர் 20-ம் நாள் மாநிலத் தலைவரின் அங்கீகாரம் கிடைக்கப்பெற்றது.

மாநிலத் தலைவரின் ஆணைப்படி,
பி. வி. இராமசந்திரன்,
சட்ட இணைச் செயலாளர்.

The Kerala General Sales Tax (Amendment) Act 1970.

1970-ன் 14-வது சட்டம்

1970-ன் கேரள பொதுவிற்பனைவரி (திருத்த) சட்டம்

1963-ன் கேரள பொதுவிற்பனைவரி சட்டத்தினை மேலும் திருத்துவதற்கான ஒரு சட்டம்.

பீடிகை.—இதன்பின்னர் வரும் நோக்கங்களின் பொருட்டு, 1963-ன் கேரள பொதுவிற்பனைவரிச் சட்டத்தினை மேலும் திருத்துவது உசிதமானதையால்;

இந்தியக் குடியரசின் இருபத்தொன்றுவது வருடத்தில் இது பின்வருமாறு சட்டமாக்கப்படட்டும்:—

1. சுருக்கத்தலைப்பு மற்றும் ஆரம்பம்:—(1) இச்சட்டம், 1970-ன் கேரள பொதுவிற்பனைவரி (திருத்த) சட்டம் என அழைக்கப்படலாம்.

(2) இப்பிரிவும், பிரிவு 6-ம் உடனடி அமலுக்குவரும்; இச்சட்டத்தின் எஞ்சியுள்ள ஏற்பாடுகள் 1970 ஏப்ரல் முதல்நாள் அமலுக்கு வந்ததாகக் கருதப்படவேண்டும்.

2. பிரிவு 5-ன் திருத்தம்.—(இதன் பின்னர் முதற்சட்டம் எனக் குறிப்பிடப்படும்) 1963-ன் கேரள பொதுவிற்பனைவரிச் சட்டத்தின் (1963-ன் 15) பிரிவு 5-ல், துணைப்பிரிவு 2-ன் காப்புவாசகத்தில் "துணைப்பிரிவு (1) அல்லது துணைப்பிரிவு (2)" எனும் சொற்கள், அடைப்புக்குறிகள் மற்றும் எண்கள் ஆகியவற்றிற்குப் பதில் "இப்பிரிவின் துணைப்பிரிவு (1) அல்லது துணைப்பிரிவு (2) அல்லது பிரிவு 5 ஏ-யின் கீழ்" எனும் சொற்கள், அடைப்புக்குறிகள் மற்றும் எழுத்துக் சேர்க்கப்படவேண்டும்.

G. 3066.

3. புதிய பிரிவு 5 ஏ-ஐ இடைப்புகுத்தல்:—முதற் சட்டத்தின் பிரிவு 5-க்குப்பின், கீழ்வரும் பிரிவு புகுத்தப்படவேண்டும், அதாவது:—

"5 ஏ. கொள்முதல் வரிவிதித்தல்:—எல்லா வியாபாரியும் ஒரு பதிவு செய்த வியாபாரியிடம் இருந்தோ மற்று ஏதேனும் நபரிடமிருந்தோ சாமான்கள் ஏதேனும் கொள்முதல் செய்யும் காலத்தில் அதன் விற்பனை அல்லது கொள்முதல் இச்சட்டத்தின்கீழ் வரிக்கு உட்பட்டதாகும், பிரிவு 5-ன் கீழ் ஒரு வரியும் செலுத்தப்படவேண்டியதல்லாத சந்தர்ப்பங்களில் மற்றும்—

(ஏ) விற்பனைக்காகவோ வேறு காரியத்திற்காகவோ மற்ற சாமான்கள் உண்டுபண்ணுவதில் அத்தகைய சாமான்கள் பயன்படுத்துவதிலோ;

(பி) மாநிலத்தில் விற்பனை செய்வது அல்லாத மற்ற ஏதேனும் வகையில் அத்தகைய சாமான்களை முடிவு செய்கிறதிலோ;

(சி) மாநிலங்களுக்குள் வாணிபம் அல்லது வர்த்தகத்தின் போக்கில் விற்பனை அல்லது கொள்முதலின் நேரடிவிளைவாக அன்றி, மாநிலத்திற்கு வெளியே ஏதேனும் இடத்திற்கு அவற்றை அனுப்புவதாலோ;

ஒரு வருடத்திற்கான அத்தகைய கொள்முதல் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட விற்றுமுதலின் அளவு எவ்வாறாயினும், பிரிவு 5-ல் குறிப்பிடப்பட்ட நிரக்குகளில் அந்த வருடத்தில் அத்தகைய கொள்முதல் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட வரி கொடுக்கவேண்டிய விற்றுமுதலின் மேல் வரி கொடுக்கவேண்டும்.

(2) துணைப்பிரிவு (1)-ல் எதுவும் அடங்கியிருந்தபோதிலும் (ஒரு தற்செயல் வியாபாரியோ நிலையாகத்தங்கும் வியாபாரியின் ஏஜன்டோ அல்லாத கொள்முதல் செய்யும் ஒரு வணிகன்) பிரிவு 5-ன்கீழ் வரிகொடுக்க உரித்தானதாகும் அந்த விற்பனை, அவரது ஒரு வருட மொத்த விற்றுமுதல் பதினாயிரம் ரூபாய்க்குக்குறைவாக இருந்தால், துணைப்பிரிவு (1)-ன் கீழ்வரி கொடுக்க உரித்தானவராகமாட்டார்.

எனினும் பிரிவு 5-ன் துணைப்பிரிவு (2)-ன் உட்பிரிவு (i)-ல் குறிப்பிட்டுள்ள சாமான்கள், சம்பந்தப்பட்ட அத்தகைய வியாபாரியின் ஒரு வருட மொத்த விற்றுமுதல் இரண்டாயிரத்து ஐநூறு ரூபாய்க்குக் குறையாமல் இருக்குமிடத்து, அந்த சாமான்கள் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட வரி கொடுக்கவேண்டிய விற்றுமுதலின் மேல் அவர் வரிகொடுக்க உரித்தானவராவார்.

(3) இந்தப் பிரிவின் மேற்சொன்ன ஏற்பாடுகளில் எதுவும் அடங்கியிருந்தபோதிலும், துணைப்பிரிவு (1)-ல் குறிப்பிட்டுள்ள சாமான்கள் கொள்முதல் செய்யும், ஒரு வியாபாரி, அவர் கொள்முதல் செய்த சாமான்களுக்கு அதன் விற்பனையில் பிரிவு 5-ன் துணைப்பிரிவு (1)-ன் உட்பிரிவு (ii)-ன்கீழ் வரி கொடுக்க உரித்தானதும், அவருடைய ஒருவருட மொத்த விற்றுமுதல் பதினாயிரம் ரூபாய்க்குக் குறையாமலும், ஆனால் இருபத்து ஐயாயிரம் ரூபாய்க்குக் கூடாமலும் இருந்தால், துணைப்பிரிவு (1)-ல் ஏற்பாடுகளுக்கிணங்க வரி செலுத்துவதற்குப் பதிலாக, அவர் விருப்பப்படி, அப்பிரிவின் ஏற்பாடுகளுக்கு இணங்க பிரிவு 7-ன் துணைப்பிரிவு (1)-ன் உட்பிரிவு (i)-ல் குறிப்பிட்டுள்ள நிரக்குகளில் வரி கொடுக்கலாம்.

4. பிரிவு 13-ன் திருத்தம்:—முதற் சட்டத்தின் 13-வது பிரிவின் துணைப் பிரிவு (3)-ன் உட்பிரிவு (ii)-க்குப்பிறகு கீழ்க்காணும் உட்பிரிவு புகுத்தப்படவேண்டும், அதாவது

"(ii ஏ) பிரிவு 5 ஏ-யின் கீழ் வரி செலுத்த உரித்தான எல்லா வியாபாரியும்;"

5. முதல் அட்டவணையின் திருத்தம்.—முதற் சட்டத்தின் முதலாவது அட்டவணையில்,—

(எ) வரிசை எண்கள் 4 மற்றும் 6-க்கு எதிராக (4)-வது கட்டத்தில் "7" என்ற எண்ணுக்குப்பதில் "12" என்ற எண் இடப்படவேண்டும்;

(பி) வரிசை எண் '8'-க்கு எதிராக (4)-வது கட்டத்தில் "8" என்ற எண்ணுக்குப்பதில் '13' என்ற எண் இடப்படவேண்டும்.

(சி) வரிசை எண்கள் 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19 மற்றும் 20-க்கு எதிராக (4)-வது கட்டத்தில் "18" என்ற எண்ணுக்குப் பதில் "45" என்ற எண் இடப்படவேண்டும்;

(டி) வரிசை எண் 48 மற்றும் அது சம்பந்தப்பட்ட பதிவுகளுக்கும் பதில் கீழ் வருபவை சேர்க்கப்படவேண்டும்,

அவையாவன:—

"48. வயர்லெஸ் ரிசப்ஷன் கருவிகள் மற்றும் அப்பாரட்டஸ், ரேடியோ மற்றும் டிரான்ஸிஸ்டர்கள் (150 ரூபாய்க்குக் கூடாத ரேடியோ மற்றும் டிரான்ஸிஸ்டர்கள் தவிர) ரேடியோ கிராமபோன், மின்வால்வுகள், அக்குமுலேட்டர்கள், ஆம்பிளிபயர்கள் மற்றும் ஒலி பெருக்கிகள் மற்றும் அவற்றின் உதிரி பாகங்களும் அதன் உபகரணங்களும்.	1.0	16
48 எ. 150 ரூபாய்க்கு அதிகமாகாத ரேடியோ மற்றும் டிரான்ஸிஸ்டர்கள் மற்றும் அவற்றின் உதிரி பாகங்களும் உபகரணங்களும்.	1.0	12"

(இ) வரிசை எண் 25 பி-க்கு எதிராக (4)-வது கட்டத்தில் "7" என்ற எண்ணுக்குப்பதில் "15" என்ற எண் இடப்படவேண்டும்.

6. தள்ளுபடியும் தவிர்ப்பும்.—(1) 1970-ன் கேரள பொதுவிற்பனை வரி (இரண்டாவது திருத்த) அவசரச் சட்டம் (1970-ன் 14) இதனால் தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்படுகிறது.

(2) இவ்வாறு தள்ளுபடி செய்யப்பட்டபோதிலும், மேற் சொன்ன அவசரச் சட்டத்தினால் திருத்தப்பட்டவாறுள்ள முதற் சட்டத்தின் கீழ் செய்யப்பட்ட எவையும் அல்லது எடுக்கப்பட்ட ஏதேனும் நடவடிக்கை இந்த அவசரச் சட்டத்தினால் திருத்தப்பட்டவாறுள்ள முதற் சட்டத்தின்கீழ் செய்யப்பட்டதாகவோ எடுக்கப்பட்டதாகவோ கருதப்படவேண்டும்.

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Agriculture (Forest Estt.) Department

NOTIFICATION

No. FE3-61649/70/Agri. *Dated, Trivandrum, 15th January* 1971.

S. R. O. No. 40/71.— In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 26 of the Kerala Act, 1961 (4 of 1962), the Government of Kerala hereby direct that an area of 9·32 acres (3·77 hectares) of land comprised in Survey No. 113 of Palode 'A' Village and forming part of Patchimala Reserve and more particularly described in the Schedule below which was declared as Reserved Forest as per section 18 of regulation 2 of 1068, and published on page 748 of Part I of the Travancore Government Gazette dated the 28th August, 1901/17-1-1076 shall cease to be a Reserved Forest with effect on and from 1-2-1971.

Schedule

Name of Block—Kidarakuzhy area transferred to Revenue Department for allotment to Harijans.

District—Trivandrum.

Taluk—Nedumangad.

Village—Palode 'A'.

Area—9·32 acres (3·77 Hectares).

No. & date of G. O. sanctioning the transfer—G. O. MS. No. 431/68/Agri. dated 23-11-1968.

Situation:—The above area is situated to the north of Kidarakuzhy Kani Settlement, to the east of Thottumpuram Registered land, to the south of Kaniyankonam Registered land and to the west of Paluvally Registered land.

Boundary Description

North:—Starting from cairn No. 1 at the north-west corner of the block the line goes in a north easterly direction for about 203·07 metres to cairn No. 5.

East & South:—From cairn No. 5, the line goes south-east for about 156 M. to cairn No. 8 passing cairn No. 7, thence south-west for about 212·89 M. passing cairn Nos. 9 to 12 to cairn No. 13.

West:—Thence the boundary goes north by slightly west for about 113·69 M. passing cairn No. 14 to cairn No. 15. Thence north, north-west for about 107·53 M. passing cairn No. 16 to cairn No. 1 at the starting point.

എസ്. ആർ. ഒ. നമ്പർ 40/71 — 1961-ലെ കേരള വന ആക്റ്റ് (1962-ലെ 4) 23-ാം വകുപ്പു നൽകപ്പെട്ട അധികാരങ്ങൾ വിനിയോഗിച്ച് കേരള ഗവൺമെന്റ്, പാലോട് 'എ' വില്ലേജിൽ, 113-ാം നമ്പർ സർവ്വേയിൽപ്പെട്ട 9.32 ഏക്കർ (3·77 ഹെക്ടർ) വിസ്തീർണ്ണമുള്ളതും, പാലോട് റിസർവ്വിന്റെ ഭാഗമായിരിക്കുന്നതും, താഴെ പട്ടികയിൽ കൂടുതൽ വിശദമായി വിവരിക്കുന്നതും, 1068-ലെ 2-ാം റെഗുലേഷൻ 18-ാം വകുപ്പുപ്രകാരം ഒരു റിസർവ്വ് വനമായി പ്രഖ്യാപിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതും, 1902 ആഗസ്റ്റ് 28-ാം തീയതിയിലെ 17-1-1076-ലെ തിരുവിതാംകൂർ ഗസറ്റ് 1-ാം ഭാഗം, 748-ാം പേജിൽ പ്രസിദ്ധപ്പെടുത്തിയിട്ടുള്ളതും, ആയ പ്രദേശം 1-2-1971 തീയതിയിലും അന്നുമുതൽക്കും ഒരു റിസർവ്വ് വനമല്ലാതായിത്തീരുന്നതാണെന്ന് ഇതിനാൽ നിർദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നു.

പട്ടിക

ബ്ലോക്കിന്റെ പേര്—ഹരിജനങ്ങൾക്ക് നൽകുന്നതിനുവേണ്ടി റവന്യൂ വകുപ്പിലേക്ക് കൈമാറ്റംചെയ്ത കിടാരക്കുഴി പ്രദേശം.

ജില്ല—തിരുവനന്തപുരം.

താലൂക്ക്—നെടുമങ്ങാട്.

വില്ലേജ്—പാലോട് 'എ'.

വിസ്തീർണ്ണം—9·32 ഏക്കർ (3·77 ഹെക്ടർ).

കൈമാറ്റം അനുവദിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ജി. ഒ. യുടെ തീയതിയും, നമ്പരും — 23-11-1963-ലെ ജി. ഒ. (എം. എസ്.) 481/63/അഗ്രി.

കിടപ്പ്—കിടാരക്കുഴി കാണി സെറ്റിൽമെന്റിന് വടക്കും, രജിസ്റ്റർചെയ്ത തോട്ടംപുറം ഭൂമിക്ക് കിഴക്കും, രജിസ്റ്റർചെയ്ത കണ്ണിയാംകോണം ഭൂമിക്ക് തെക്കും, രജിസ്റ്റർചെയ്ത പാലുവള്ളി ഭൂമിക്ക് പടിഞ്ഞാറുമായി പ്രസ്തുത സ്ഥലം സ്ഥിതിചെയ്യുന്നു.

അതിർത്തി വിവരണം

വടക്ക്—അതിർത്തിരേഖ ബ്ലോക്കിന്റെ വടക്കുപടിഞ്ഞാറെ മൂലയിലെ ഒന്നാം നമ്പർ ജണ്ടയിൽനിന്നും ആരംഭിച്ച് ഉദ്ദേശം 209·07 മീറ്റർ വടക്കുകിഴക്കായി 5-ാം നമ്പർ ജണ്ടയിലേക്ക് പോകുന്നു.

കിഴക്കും, തെക്കും—5-ാം നമ്പർ ജണ്ടയിൽനിന്നും, അതിർത്തിരേഖ ഉദ്ദേശം 150 മീറ്റർ തെക്കുകിഴക്കായി ഏഴാം നമ്പർ ജണ്ട കടന്ന് 8-ാം നമ്പർ ജണ്ടയിൽ ചേരുന്നു. അവിടെനിന്നും, ഉദ്ദേശം 212·89 മീറ്റർ കിഴക്കുപടിഞ്ഞാറായി 9-ാം നമ്പർ മുതൽ 12-ാം നമ്പർ വരെയുള്ള ജണ്ടകൾ കടന്ന് 13-ാം നമ്പർ ജണ്ടയിൽ ചേരുന്നു.

പടിഞ്ഞാറ്—അവിടെനിന്നും അതിർത്തിരേഖ അല്പം പടിഞ്ഞാറുമാറി ഉദ്ദേശം 113·69 മീറ്റർ വടക്കോട്ടായി 14-ാം നമ്പർ ജണ്ട കടന്ന് 15-ാം നമ്പർ ജണ്ടയിൽ ചേരുന്നു. അവിടെനിന്നും വടക്കോട്ട് ഉദ്ദേശം 107·58 മീറ്റർ വടക്കുപടിഞ്ഞാറായി 16-ാം നമ്പർ ജണ്ട കടന്ന് ആരംഭസ്ഥാനമായ 1-ാം നമ്പർ ജണ്ടയിൽ എത്തുന്നു.

By order of the Governor,

N. R. PRABHAKARAN,

Joint Secretary.

Kerala Gazette No. 5 dated 2nd February 1971.

PART I **Section iv**

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Local Administration (Panchayat Special) Department

NOTIFICATION

G. O. MS. 14/71. *Dated, Trivandrum, 27th January* 1971.

S. R. O. No. 42/71.— In exercise of the powers conferred by sub section (1) of section 142 of the Kerala Panchayats Act, 1960 (32 of 1960) the Government of Kerala, at the request of the Koduvayur Panchayat in its resolution No. 184 dated the 1st July, 1970, hereby declare that the provisions of the Law relating to Municipalities mentioned in the schedule below shall be extended to and be in force in the Koduvayur Panchayat area in Palghat District with effect from 7th February, 1971.

SCHEDULE

Chapters IX and X and section 359 of the Kerala Municipalities Act, 1960 (Act 14 of 1961) and the Kerala Municipal Building Rules, 1968.

By order of the Governor,

P. T. AUGUSTINE,
Deputy Secretary.

Explanatory Note

(This note is not part of this notification but is intended to its general purport).

The Koduvayur Panchayat has requested that the Building regulations under the Municipalities Act may be applied to the Koduvayur Panchayat areas. This notification is intended to comply with the request of the Panchayat.

G. 255

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Water and Power (Electricity) Department

NOTIFICATION

G. O. (MS) No. 10/71/W&P. *Dated, Trivandrum, 27th January 1971.*

S. R. O. No. 43 /71.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 16 of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 (Central Act LIV of 1948) the Government of Kerala after consultation with the interests specified in column (2) of the Schedule hereto annexed or persons concerned, appoint in addition to the members of the Kerala State Electricity Board, the persons specified in column (3) thereof, to be members of the Kerala State Electricity Consultative Council representing the interests respectively, specified against them in column (2).

The members of the Council shall hold office for a period of 2 years from the date of publication of this notification.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	*Interests*	*Persons appointed*
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	Local Self Government	Shri S. Narasimha Naik, Chairman, Municipal Council, Vaikom. (Secretary, Chamber of Municipal Chairmen)
2.	Local Self Government	Shri C. Vasudeva Menon, M. L. A., President, Kollengode Panchayat
3.	Electricity Supply Industry	Shri S. Koder, Cochin Electric Company, Fort Cochin
4.	Commerce	Shri K. B. Muhammed Ibrahim, Piece Goods Merchant, Cloth Bazar, Ernakulam
5.	Industry	Shri M. K. K. Nayar, Managing Director, F. A. C. T., Udyogamandal, Alwaye

(1)	(2)	(3)
6.	Industry	Shri P. V. Korah, Works Manager, Indian Aluminium Co., Ltd., Alwaye
7.	Transport	Shri K. C. Pazhanimala, Thenmalapur Bus Transport, Palghat
8.	Transport	Shri S. Raghavan, S. R. Motors, Varkala
9.	Agriculture	Shri N. I. Devassykutty, M.L.A., Manalur, Trichur
10.	Agriculture	Shri E. John Jacob, M. L. A., Elanjikal Niranam, Thiruvalla
11.	Labour employed in Electricity Supply Industry	Shri J. Chitharanjan, Pulivilayil House, Mundakkal East, Quilon (President, K. S. E. B. Employee's Union, Cochin)
12.	,,	Shri P. K. Gopalakrishna Pillai, General Secretary, Kerala State Electricity Board Executive Employees' Union, Cochin-18
13.	,,	Shri M. K. Kunhiraman, General Secretary, Kerala State Electricity Board Labour Union, Nochaten Parambath House, Meppayur P. O., Calicut District
14.	Consumers of Electricity	Shri M. J. Usman, Jacharia Manzil, Jacharia Bazar, Alleppey
15.	..	Shri A. C. Jose, Advocate, Ernakulam

By order of the Governor,

K. P. Viswanathan Nair,
Secretary.

Kerala Gazette No. 5 dated 2nd February 1971
PART I **Section Iv**

GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

Abstract

RULES—TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE—RULE 57, PART II, KERALA SERVICE RULES—AMENDMENT—ISSUED.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

G. O. (P) No. 10/71/Fin. **Dated, Trivandrum, 5th January 1971.**

Read:—Letter No. B6-54087/70-1 dated 5-10-1970 from the Inspector General of Police.

ORDER

In the letter cited, the Inspector General of Police has brought to the notice of Government that as the provisions contained in the Note 2 to rule 57 of Part II, Kerala Service Rules do not cover the case of District Armed Reserve Personnel stationed at Malappuram, no Daily Allowance could be admitted to them for their halt at Melmuri. The Note 2 to rule 57 of Part II covers the case of M.S.P. Personnel stationed at Malappuram only. The Inspector General of Police, therefore, requests Government to issue orders extending the provisions contained in the Note 2 to Part II, Kerala Service Rules to the District Armed Reserve Personnel stationed at Malappuram also. After examining all the aspects of the question, Government are pleased to issue the following notification.

NOTIFICATION

S.R.O No.44/71.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub section (1) of section 2 of the Kerala Public Services Act, 1968 (19 of 1968) read with section 3 thereof, the Government of Kerala hereby make the following amendment to theKerala Service Rules, namely:-

AMENDMENT

C. S. No. 211/70/Fin.

In part II of the said rules, in rule 57, for note 2 the following note shall be substituted, namely:-

4/135/S.

"The Malabar Special Police and the District Armed Rrserve Personnel stationed at Ma appuram who have to halt for a period of ten days at Melmuri Rifle Range, situated within eight Kilometres from Malappuram, in connection with the aonual firing course there, shall be xempted fr om the operation of the above rule."

By order of the Governor,

P. K. GOPINATHA MENON,
Under Secretary.

To

The Controller of Accounts, Kerala, Trivandram.
All Heads of Departments and Offices.
All Departments and Sections of Se retariat.
The Secretary, Kerala Public Service Commission (with C. L.)
The Regis rar, High Court of Kerala (with C. L.)
The Registrar, University of Kerala (with C. L.)
The Registrar, University of Calicut (with C. L.)
All Officers of Secretariat.
The Secretary to Governor.
The Private Secretarirs to the Chief Minister and other Ministers.
The Stenographer to the Chief Secretary

Kerala Gazette No. 5 dated 2nd February 1971
PART III

ERRATUM NOTIFICATION

No. Ex. E4-37951/70. *22nd January* 1971.

Sub.—**Trained Teachers Certificate Examination—1st Year May 1971**

In modification to this office Notification No. Ex. E4-37951/70 dated 8th December 1970 published in the Kerala Gazette No. 51 dated 22-12-1970, the following changes have been effected in the Time Table already published.

Day	*Date*	*Time*	*Subject*
Friday	21-5-1971	10 a. m. to 12 Noon	Regional Language
Monday	24-5-1971	10 a. m. to 12 Noon	English
Tuesday	25-5-1971	10 a. m. to 12 Noon	Mathematics
Wednesday	26-5-1971	10 a. m. to 12 Noon	General Science
Friday	28-5-1971	10 a. m. to 12 Noon	Social Studies

Office of the Commissioner
for Government Examinations,
Trivandrum–14.

P. LAKSHMANAN NAIR,
Secretary to the Commissioner for Government Examinations.

G. 9/J

Kerala Gazette No. 5 dated 2nd February 1971
PART III

ERRATUM NOTIFICATION

No. Ex. E1-37593/70. *22nd January* 1971.

Sub.—**Trained Teachers Certificate Examination—II Year May 1971**

In modification to this office Notification No. Ex. E1-37593/70 dated 9th December 1970 published in the Kerala Gazette No. 51 dated 22nd December 1970 the following changes have been effected in the Time Table already published.

Day	*Date*	*Time*	*Subject*
Tuesday	18-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m	General Principles of Education and School Organisation.
Wednesday	19-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m.	Educational Psychology and Health Education
Friday	21-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m.	Methods of Teaching Regional Language
Monday	24-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m	Methods of Teaching English
Tuesday	25-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m.	Methods of Teaching Mathematics
Wednesday	26-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m.	Methods of Teaching General Science
Friday	28-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m.	Methods of Teaching Social Studies

Office of the Commissioner
for Government Examinations,
Trivandrum-14.

P. Lakshmanan Nair,
Secretary to the Commissioner for Government Examinations.

G. 10/J.

Kerala Gazette No. 5 dated 2nd February 1971
PART III

ERRATUM NOTIFICATION

No. Ex. E4-37450/70. 22nd January 1971.

Sub.—**Language Teachers Training Course Examination—May 1971**

In modification to this office Notification No. Ex. E4-37450/70 dated 5th December 1970 published in the Kerala Gazette No. 51 dated 22nd December 1970, the following changes have been effected in the Time Table already published.

Day	*Date*	*Time*	*Subject*
Friday	21-5-1971	2 p. m. to 4 p. m.	Social Studies
Monday	24-5-1971	2 p. m. to 4 p. m.	General Science
Tuesday	25-5-1971	2 p. m. to 4 p. m.	General Principles of Education and Educational Psychology
Wednesday	26-5-1971	2 p. m. to 4 p. m.	School Organisation and Health Education
Friday	28-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m.	Methods of Teaching Languages

Office of the Commissioner
for Government Examinations,
Trivandrum-14.

P. Lakshmanan Nair,
Secretary to the Commissioner for Government Examinations.

G 11 J.

ERRATUM NOTIFICATION

No. Ex. E4-37355/70.

22nd January 1971.

Sub.—**Diploma Course of Examination in Hindi—May 1971**

In modification to this office Notification No. Ex. E4-37355/70 dated 4th December 1970 published in the Kerala Gazette No. 51 dated 15th December 1970, the following changes have been effected in the Time Table already published.

Day	*Date*	*Time*	*Subject*
Wednesday	19-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m.	Methods of language teaching with special reference to the teaching of Hindi as other language (Principles and Methods of teaching with special reference to the latest methods of teaching language)
Friday	21-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m.	Pedagogical linguistics and techniques of language comparison (Educational Psychology)
Monday	24-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m.	Psychology of learning and remedial education general linguistics, comparative philology, Hindi language its History and developments and its relation with other Indian languages
Tuesday	25-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m.	Principles of Education, School organisation and Health Education (Hindi literature old and new)
Wednesday	26-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m.	Hindi literature (General Indian History and culture with special reference to the National movement and the problem of national language)
Friday	28-5-1971	2 p. m. to 5 p. m.	History of Indian Education

Office of the Commissioner
for Government Examinations,
Trivandrum-14.

P. Lakshmanan Nair,
Secretary to the Commissioner for Government Examinations.

G 12 J.

Kerala Gazette No. 5 dated 2nd February 1971.
PART III

CHALAKUDY MUNICIPALITY

NOTIFICATION

No. E. 78/71.   [illegible].71 ജനുവരി 16.

1961-ലെ ആക്ടനുസരിച്ച് ഭേദഗതി ചെയ്ത കേരള മുനിസിപ്പാലിറ്റീസ് ആക്ട് 1960, 412-ാം വകുപ്പുപ്രകാരം എനിക്ക് നിക്ഷിപ്തമായിരിക്കുന്ന അധികാരമുപയോഗിച്ച് ചാലക്കുടി മുനിസിപ്പാലിറ്റി വക താഴെ വിവരിക്കുന്ന പ്രോപ്പർട്ടികൾ ഉപയോഗിക്കുന്നതിന് പ്രസ്തുത ആക്ടിലെ 2[illegible], 2[illegible]5 (4) 3[illegible] (1) [illegible]3 (3) എന്നീ വകുപ്പുകളനുസരിച്ച് താഴെ പറയുന്ന നിരക്കനുസരിച്ച് 1.4.1971 മുതൽ ഫീസ് ഈടാക്കുന്നതാണെന്ന വസ്തുത പൊതുജനങ്ങളുടെ അറിവിലേക്കായി ഇതിനാൽ പ്രസിദ്ധപ്പെടുത്തിയിരിക്കുന്നു.

ഫീസ് നിരക്കുകളുടെ പട്ടിക

I മുനിസിപ്പൽ മാർക്കറ്റ്:

(i) സസ്യചന്ത

		രൂ.	പൈ.
(1)	കൈച്ചുമട് ഒന്നിന്	0	05
(2)	തലച്ചുമട് ഒന്നിന്	0	15
(3)	കാവ് do.	0	25
(4)	സൈക്കിളിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരുന്നതിന്	0	25
(5)	കൈവണ്ടി do.	0	50
(6)	മൃഗങ്ങൾ വലിക്കുന്ന വണ്ടി do.	1	00
(7)	ലോറി do.	5	00
(8)	കോഴി, താറാവ് മുതലായവ ഒന്നിന്	0	05
(9)	കാള വണ്ടി ഒന്നിന്	0	25
(10)	മൃഗങ്ങൾ വലിക്കുന്ന വണ്ടി ഒന്നിന്	0	50
(11)	ലോറി ഒന്നിന് do.	2	00
(12)	പഴം, മത്സ്യം മുതലായവ പാത്രങ്ങളിൽ കൊണ്ടുനടന്ന് വില്പന നടത്തുന്നതിന്	0	05
	do. ഇരുന്ന് വില്പന നടത്തുന്നതിന്	0	10

(ii) മത്സ്യചന്ത

(a) പച്ച മത്സ്യം

(1)	കൈച്ചുമട് ഒന്നിന്	0	10
(2)	തലച്ചുമട്	0	25
(3)	കാവ് ഒന്നിന്	0	50
(4)	സൈക്കിളിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരുന്നതിന്	0	75
(5)	കൈവണ്ടി ഒന്നിന്	1	50
(6)	ലോറി ഒന്നിന്	5	00

		രൂ.	പൈ.
(b)	ഉന്തകരസ്യം		
(1)	കൈച്ചുമടായി കൊണ്ടുവരുന്നതിന് ഒന്നിന്	0	05
(2)	തലച്ചുമട് ഒന്നിന്	0	15
(3)	കാറ് ഒന്നിന്	0	30
(4)	സൈക്കിളിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരുന്നതിന്	0	50
(5)	കൈവണ്ടി ഒന്നിന്	1	00
(6)	ലോറി ഒന്നിന്	2	50

Note—ചന്തയിൽ കുറികൾ എടുത്ത് സ്ഥിരമായി കച്ചവടം ചെയ്യുന്നവരുടെ കടയിലേക്ക് വില്പനക്കായി കൊണ്ടുവരുന്ന സാധനങ്ങൾക്ക് ഫീസ് ഈടാക്കാവുന്നതല്ല.

II	കശാപ്പുശാല		
(1)	ചെമ്മരിയാട്, പോർക്ക്, കോലാട് etc. ഒന്നിന്	0	50
(2)	പശു, കാള, എരുമ, പോത്ത് ഒന്നിന്	1	00
III	കന്നുകാലിച്ചന്ത		
(1)	ആട്, പോർക്ക്, കോലാട്, ചെമ്മരിയാട്, കഴുത ഒന്നിന്	0	15
(2)	പശു, കാള, പോത്ത്, എരുമ ഒന്നിന്	0	25
(3)	താറാവ്, കോഴി ഒന്നിന്	0	05
IV	ബസ്സ്സ്റ്റാന്റ്		
(1)	ബസ്സ് ഒന്നിന് (ദിവസം.)	1	00
V	കടത്ത്		
(1)	6 വയസ്സിനുമേൽ (ആളൊന്നിന്) do.	0	05
(2)	സൈക്കിൾ ഒന്നിന്	0	10
(3)	ചരക്ക് 15 Kg. ക്ക് മേൽ	0	03

Note—വിദ്യാർത്ഥികളിൽ നിന്നും കടത്തുകൂലി ഈടാക്കുന്നതല്ല.

VI	മണൽ വാരൽ		
	ഈ മുനിസിപ്പാലിറ്റി വക മണൽ വാരൽ കേന്ദ്രങ്ങളിൽ നിന്നും മണൽ വാരുന്നതിന് 1 M³-ന്	0	50
VIII	പാറ ഉടക്കൽ		
	പാറയിൽനിന്നും കല്ലുടക്കുന്നതിന് 1 M³-ന്	0	50

മുനിസിപ്പൽ കൗൺസിലിനുവേണ്ടി,

(Sd.)

Special Officer,
Municipal Council, Chalakudy.

Kerala Gazette No. 5 dated 2nd February 1971

PART III

NOTIFICATION

No. A6-69552/70-43. *1st February* 1971.

The following is the supplementary select list, as approved by the Government, of Officers for promotion to the category of Circle Inspectors of Police for the year 1970 prepared by the Departmental Promotion Committee.

Select List

1.	S. Rajagopalan.	Sub Inspector of Police
2.	M. M. Abdul Rahiman	do.
3.	V. A. Chandy	do.
4.	A. Mohammed Sheriff	do.
5.	V. Kamalasanan	do.
6.	G. Vikraman Nair	do.
7.	S. Parameswaran Pillai	do.
8.	M. S. Rajan Menon	do.
9.	N. Unni	do.
10.	[illegible]. Gopalan	do.
11.	R. Krishna Iyer	do.
12.	E. Mammy	do.
13.	V. K. Sankaran Nair	do.
14.	K. N. Bal	do.
15.	K. S. Vishnu Namboothiri	do.
16.	K. Balakrishnan	do.
17.	S. K. Viswambharan	do.
18.	G. Surendran	do.
19.	A. Mohammed Khan	do.
20.	Harris Xavier	do.
21.	N. P. Balakrishnan	do.
22.	K. A. Thankappan Pillai	do.
23.	K. Karunakaran Pillai	do.
24.	K. P. Karunakaran Nair	do.
25.	P. C. Padmanabhan Nambiar	do.
26.	P. A. Mathew	do.
27.	S. Periamettan Sahib	do.
28.	P. Gopalan Nair	do.
29.	N. Balakrishna Pillai	do.
30.	S. T. Thanu Pillai	do.
31.	G. Krishnankutty	do.

M. GOPALAN,
Inspector General of Police.

(Convener, Departmental Promotion Committee for the preparation of Select list of Sub Inspectors of Police fit for promotion as Circle Inspectors of Police).

Office of the Inspector General of Police, Kerala State, Trivandrum-10.

8 0 Kz